

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

TAREK J. HELOU (CABN 218225)
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7071
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
Tarek.J.Helou@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR No. 08-70183 JCS
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
)	EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3161
v.)	
)	
PEK HOON MARGARET LIM,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

On April 3, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time from April 3, 2008 through April 10, 2008 should be excluded from Speedy Trial Act calculations because defense counsel needed adequate time to prepare for court proceedings. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(F). The parties represented to the Court that the length of the requested continuance was the reasonable amount of time necessary for effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties

also agreed that the ends of justice served by this continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

Furthermore, the parties also appeared before the Court on April 10, 2008, and stipulated that time from April 10, 2008 through April 16, 2008 should be excluded from Speedy Trial Act calculations because defense counsel needed adequate time to review discovery, which the government produced recently. The parties represented to the Court that the length of the requested continuance was the reasonable amount of time necessary for effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by this continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

DATED: April 11, 2008

/s/
TAREK J. HELOU
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: April 11, 2008


/s/
GEOFFREY HANSEN
Attorney for Defendant Margaret Pek Hoon Lim

As the Court stated on April 3, 2008, and for the reasons identified above, the Court finds that time from April 3, 2008 through April 10, 2008 shall be excluded from Speedy Trial Act calculations because defense counsel needed time for effective preparation for court proceedings. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). Furthermore, as the Court stated on April 3, 2008, and for the reasons identified above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the requested continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)

1 The Court also finds that time from April 10, 2008 through April 16, 2008 shall be excluded
2 from Speedy Trial Act calculations for effective preparation of counsel because defense counsel
3 needs adequate time to review discovery. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). Failing to grant the
4 requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation,
5 taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. 18
6 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

7
8 SO ORDERED.

9
10 DATED: April 15, 2008



THE HONORABLE JAMES LARSON
United States Magistrate Judge